

Serial No. 09/525,090

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to Examiner Pham for the courtesies extended to Applicants' attorney during a telephone interview on April 28, 2004. Pursuant to the discussion in that interview, Applicants have amended the application by canceling claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 16, and 19 so that only claims 7, 9, 12-15, 17 and 18 remain pending in the application. Although agreement was not reached on whether Applicants' claims 7 and 9 overcame the cited reference, Examiner Pham did agree to discuss the patentability of the claims with her supervisor. Examiner Pham did agree that claim 15 would be allowable if made dependent from the now amended claim 12.

Applicants respectfully request additional consideration and review of claims 7, 9, and 15 in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11, 15-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Rahul Jain et al., "Geographical Routing Using Partial Information For Wireless Ad Hoc Networks", 20 December 1999. Applicants have responded to this rejection by canceling claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 16, and 19 to expedite prosecution of this application.

Claim 12, which the Examiner has allowed as patentable and which was previously dependent from now canceled claim 1, has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate all the limitations of its predecessor. Claim 15, previously dependent from now canceled claim 1, has been amended to depend from claim 12 which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Therefore dependent claim 15 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons as independent claim 12.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that Applicants' claims 7 and 9 are anticipated by the cited reference. Applicants respectfully disagree. Jain discloses that the routing tables contain a list of nodes and their geographic positions (e.g., location information), as stated on page 3, section 3.

Serial No. 09/525,090

Also, Jain's geographical routing algorithm uses only the position information in making its routing decisions. Jain discloses two ways in which the routing tables are updated. First, Jain discloses that new routing entries can only be added to the routing tables through the route discovery protocol, as stated on page 11, paragraph 3. The route discovery protocol finds a path from a node to a destination node when the packet is stuck at the node. The destination node sends an ACK packet to all nodes along the path to update their routing tables.

Second, Jain discloses an extension of the geographical routing algorithm, called the tear down protocol, that allows routing tables to be kept consistent by having each node transmit its routing table as part of a "hello" message to discover its neighboring topology, as stated on page 15, section 6.2. Each node then uses its neighbors' routing tables to check the validity of its own routing table. However, in both cases Jain does not disclose that the node positions or routing tables are transmitted periodically as recited in Applicants' claim 7 or at different times as recited in Applicants' claim 9. Therefore, Jain, does not anticipate, show or suggest transmitting periodically as pointed out in Applicants' claim 7 or at different times as pointed out in Applicants' claim 9.

Claim 7, previously dependent from now canceled claim 5 and now believed to be patentable, has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate all the limitations of its predecessor.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 7, 9 and 15.

Allowed Claims

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 12-14, 17, and 18.

Serial No. 09/525,090

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 7, 9, 12-15, 17, and 18 are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues that the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve the issues.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Ahmed

By James Milton
James Milton, Attorney
Reg. No. 46935
(732) 949-7365

Date: 4-28-2004

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any paper referred to as being transmitted therewith) is being facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313 on the date shown below.

James Milton
James Milton

4-28, 2004
Date